



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/705,238	11/12/2003	Dac-Jong Jang	1793.1060	3540

21171 7590 10/18/2006

STAAS & HALSEY LLP  
SUITE 700  
1201 NEW YORK AVENUE, N.W.  
WASHINGTON, DC 20005

EXAMINER
----------

KAYRISH, MATTHEW

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2627

DATE MAILED: 10/18/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Advisory Action  
Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief**

Application No.

10/705,238

Applicant(s)

JANG ET AL.

Examiner

Matthew G. Kayrish

Art Unit

2627

**--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --**

THE REPLY FILED 18 September 2006 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.

1. ☒ The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:

- a) ☐ The period for reply expires \_\_\_\_\_ months from the mailing date of the final rejection.  
b) ☒ The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.

Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**NOTICE OF APPEAL**

2. ☐ The Notice of Appeal was filed on \_\_\_\_\_. A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).

**AMENDMENTS**

3. ☐ The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because  
(a) ☐ They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);  
(b) ☐ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);  
(c) ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or  
(d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: \_\_\_\_\_. (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).

4. ☐ The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).  
5. ☐ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): \_\_\_\_\_.  
6. ☐ Newly proposed or amended claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).  
7. ☐ For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) ☐ will not be entered, or b) ☐ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.  
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:  
Claim(s) allowed: \_\_\_\_\_.  
Claim(s) objected to: \_\_\_\_\_.  
Claim(s) rejected: \_\_\_\_\_.  
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: \_\_\_\_\_.

**AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE**

8. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will not be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).  
9. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome all rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).  
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.

**REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER**

11. ☐ The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: \_\_\_\_\_  
12. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_  
13. ☒ Other: \_\_\_\_\_. 1449

Matthew G. Kayrish

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### ***Information Disclosure Statement***

The submission of the information disclosure statement (IDS) submitted on 2/11/2005 is in compliance with the provisions of 37 CFR 1.97. Accordingly, the information disclosure statement is being considered by the examiner.

### ***Response to Arguments***

In response to applicant's arguments against the references individually, one cannot show nonobviousness by attacking references individually where the rejections are based on combinations of references. See *In re Keller*, 642 F.2d 413, 208 USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981); *In re Merck & Co.*, 800 F.2d 1091, 231 USPQ 375 (Fed. Cir. 1986).

The Remarks disclose that Santo et al discusses, a problem exists due to ineffective portions of the tracking coils, which do not contribute to the generation of the driving force in the tracking direction, and thus a tilt occurs in the moving member. Santo et al specifically discloses:

There is a problem that this radial tilt causes an aberration in the light beam spot focused on the recording face of the disc, adversely affecting the correct record and reproduction of signals.

The examiner maintains that Santo et al does not teach against the use of neutral positions because they cause ineffective portions, however, Santo et al moves to overcome these ineffective portions, which are the deficiencies of the prior art. The

examiner maintains that the rejection stands based on the embodiment of figures 10 & 11, and the examiner further maintains that the rejection stands because it is not based on the prior art embodiment of figure 14 which the Remarks moves to argue.

Also, In response to applicant's argument that Kasuga would not apply to Santo et al because Santo et al teaches away from a neutral zone, the test for obviousness is not whether the features of a secondary reference may be bodily incorporated into the structure of the primary reference; nor is it that the claimed invention must be expressly suggested in any one or all of the references. Rather, the test is what the combined teachings of the references would have suggested to those of ordinary skill in the art. See *In re Keller*, 642 F.2d 413, 208 USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981).

The Office Action sent on 7/25/2006 acknowledges that Santo fails to cure the positions of a neutral zone in the following passage:

Santo et al fails to specifically disclose:

Wherein the position of the neutral zone between the first and third magnet parts and the position of the neutral zone between the second and fourth magnet parts along the focusing direction are changeable in order to optimize a tracking sensitivity.

Kasuga et al disclose:

Wherein the position of the neutral zone between the first and third magnet parts (figure 9, item Z) and the position of the neutral zone between the second and fourth magnet parts (figure 9, item Z) along the

focusing direction are changeable (See figure 9) in order to optimize a tracking sensitivity (column 4, lines 16-28 & lines 61-67).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to place changeable gaps between Santo et al's magnets for the purpose of adjusting the height of the lens holder in the focus direction. When adding this feature to Santo et al's magnets, the L-shape of the magnets combined with the adjustment of the square magnet would provide for a change in the magnetic flux in both the tracking and the focus direction, therefore, one would be able to physically set the magnets for optimal sensitivity in the tracking direction. Furthermore, by adding the changeability to the magnets, the flux intensity distribution would be changing asymmetrically depending on how much each individual magnet was moved with respect to the spacing [Z].

This is further discussed in column 5 of Kasuga, because the weight of the lens holder will actually weight itself down due to gravity. The magnets can be adjusted to optimize the position, making the lens holder. The adjustment of the magnets creates various neutral points in between the magnets, but this will also adjust the lens holder to the correct position for limiting tilt and focus problems.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Matthew G. Kayrish whose telephone number is 571-272-4220. The examiner can normally be reached on 8am - 5pm M-F.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, William Korzuch can be reached on 571-272-7589. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Matthew G. Kayrish

10/13/2006

MK

  
WILLIAM KORZUCH  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600